DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 088 HE 014 114

AUTHOR Melchiori, Gerlinda S.
TITLE Planning for 2001: Smaller and Better. AIR Forum 1981 Paper.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 24p.: Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (21st, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-20, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy: Administrator Role: College Administration: *College Faculty: *College Programs: *Decision Making: Departments: Higher Education: Institutional Research: Policy Formation: *Reduction in Force: *Retrenchment: State Surveys: Student Role: Teacher Dismissal: Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum: *Program Discontinuance: University of Michigan

ABSTRACT

Results of a 1979 survey of 46 states on patterns of program reduction are presented, and the institutional shrinkage process currently being implemented at the University of Michigan is examined. Additionally, several hierarchical and sequential reduction strategies, including Balderston's budgetary strategies, are reviewed. At the University of Michigan four specific strategies are being considered: across-the-board cuts, reduction of nonacademic programs, long-range faculty reduction procedures, and program discontinuance. At the University of Michigan it became obvious at various points that there are definite limits to faculty and student participation in this institutional process. It is suggested that the pros and cons of discontinuing a department cannot be resolved by the collective faculty or students. The size of the institution and the complexity of its various budgets and existing commitments limit insight and thus the utility of input. It is recommended that rather than have the administration gathering initial information and the affected department gathering counter information, the entire function might be delegated to the institutional research office. Disagreement concerning the rationale for or against program/department discontinuance seems to be over the relative importance of quality versus centrality of the discipline. Additional problems regarding the elimination of academic programs are described. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205088

PLANNING FOR 2001:

SMALLER AND BETTER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association for

~~Institutional Research~~

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Gerlinda S. Melchiori
Coordinator of Academic Affairs
College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Paper presented at the 1981 AIR Forum
Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota

HE 014 114

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Twenty-First Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 17-20, 1981. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

PLANNING FOR 2001:

SMALLER AND BETTER

ABSTRACT

This paper, first, discusses several hierarchical and sequential reduction options including Balderston's budgetary strategies and this author's curricular change options. The latter is based on data gathered in a 1979-80 survey of 46 states on patterns of program reduction. Having introduced various reduction categories, the paper then focuses on the institutional shrinkage process currently being implemented at the University of Michigan. Four specific strategies are being discussed: 1) Across-the-board cuts; 2) Reduction of non-Academic programs; 3) Long-range faculty reduction procedures; and 4) Program discontinuance. A host of potential problems regarding the elimination of academic programs are described. The paper concludes by providing several general recommendations for institutional shrinkage procedures.

Much has been written about retrenchment. Case studies and surveys of both institutional and state level processes and strategies have burgeoned. Paradigms and theoretical frameworks analyzing the characteristics and radius of impact along the lines of hierarchical or sequential parameters have been developed (Cheit, Balderston). Cheit's survey (1971) identified five main (sequential) categories of responses: Postponing, belt-tightening, cutting and reallocating, scrambling for new funds, and planning and worrying. Balderston (1974), dealing mainly in terms of budgetary issues, mentioned four basic strategies: adjusting budgetary standards (raising student/faculty ratios for instance); proportioning budget cuts;decentralizing revenue and expenditure control ("every tub on its own bottom"); and differentiating budget cuts according to selective priorities.

This author's 1979 survey focused on patterns of program reduction. With 46 states participating, a comprehensive data base was established regarding the range of program change options available, the frequency of their use, as well as their specific attributes (Melchiori, 1980a). The data on reduction options was assembled along the lines of the so-called Hirschman model and is presented in Table I.

In his book on decline in firms and organizations, Hirschman (1970) proposed two basic options, Voice and Exit. Voice can be defined as an attempt to, first, identify the causes responsible for the decline of a product or a program, and, subsequently, propose (or voice) mechanisms for improving its marketability if an analysis shows that it warrants continuation. Exit, on the other hand, refers to the elimination of a product or program if the review indicates that it is no longer viable, compatible, or essential. It is important that considerations not only focus on these two poles but also on the interplay between them. Testing the elasticity between retention and extinction is to consider options and develop innovative alternatives. Applying this model to the above mentioned data on patterns of program reduction one finds that the majority of options

TABLE I

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REDUCTION: VARIATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

VOICE	VOICE-EXIT INTERPLAY		EXIT
CONTINUATION →	ALTERNATIVES MODIFICATION →	MERGER →	TERMINATION →
Unconditional Continuation	Changes in Structure of Program	Departmental Merger	Elimination of Paper Program
Contingent Continuation	Changes in Curricular Design	Merger by Dispersal	Elimination of Specific Degree
Conditional Continuation	Changes in Mode of Delivery	Generic Merger	Elimination of Degree-Granting Authority
	Budget Staff Reductions	Thematic Merger	Program Elimination
	Elimination of Sub-fields	Supra-Collegiate Merger	Department Elimination
	General Phase-Down	Supra-Institutional Merger (Consortia, Rotation)	Unit/Department/College Elimination

indeed lie in the gray area between Voice and Exit.

Arranged in a continuum, the four categories are: 1) Continuation, 2) Modification; 3) Merger; and 4) Termination.

Briefly, a program may be continued "as is" or placed on implicit or explicit probation. Two variations are pertinent: contingent continuation which supports continuation pending the fulfillment of specifically stated conditions, e.g., securing funds or attaining accreditation; conditional continuation, which implies that a program is placed on probation for a stated period of time. Conditions may indicate that it will be phased out unless more students are attracted or the quality of the faculty is upgraded.

The second category, Modification, contains a variety of options that are designed to explore the elasticity of a program's potential for change if the initial agreement is reached that it is worthwhile retaining albeit with less resources. Several change options are noted.

Moving even closer to Exit, Merger also tests the flexibility of a particular program. A merger decision signals that retention is only feasible if major adjustments are made, such as pooling resources or realigning programs. The determinants for selecting a specific merger variation are directly related to the weaknesses of the program such as a declining student pool, high equipment, computer, or library costs, changes in the discipline and marketplace, and so on.

Moving on into the fourth category, Termination, leaves behind the area of exploring options and enters a less fluid arena. Although any of the previous three categories may eventually include program discontinuance, this category states such intents much more bluntly. The term itself is ambiguous as no uniform criteria are used in defining it. Research indicates that closure activities tend to entail the elimination of specific degrees within a department or the discontinuance of programs whose faculty and students already have

dwindled away. The elimination of academic departments and entire colleges is occurring on a minimal level.

Having introduced various budgetary and programmatic decision categories, it is appropriate to turn to the case at hand and see what combination of strategies were chosen to induce the desired shrinkage at the University of Michigan. A large, public institution, U-M is recognized for its excellence in research and teaching. Operating under an independent charter granted at the state's constitutional convention in 1850, the school has enjoyed a high degree of autonomy from external interference and control. The University is noted for its decentralized decision-making process and practice of faculty governance.

Much has been written this year about the economic conditions of various Midwestern States. In Michigan in particular, the decline of the auto industry, the rise in oil costs, an unemployment rate twice as high as the national average, as well as an increase in out-migration of residents led to a severe reduction in state revenues. Salaries in many sectors of the work force have been rolled back and market behavior indicated that the population was in a no-nonsense mood. In 1980, state appropriations for higher education reflected an actual budget reduction. In view of the fact that shortfalls were predicted to continue for several years, the decision was made at U-M to explore a wider range of reduction options than had been the case in previous years.

Research on organizational change (Melchiori, 1980b) identified many reasons as to why change (e.g., reductions) are difficult to implement. DeLeon (1978) lists institutional conservatism, legal obstacles, high start-up costs for change, and the formation of anti-termination coalitions as barriers. Bardach (1978), in discussing the political undercurrents of termination processes, adds the lack of appropriate incentive structures, the fear of the uncertain, and the expectation of "entitlement to" ... a program, tenure, job

security to this list. Behn (1978) and Cameron (1978) see the best course of action in taking advantage of ideological shifts (growth to non-growth) to demonstrate harm if no change (reduction) occurs.

Clearly, the climate in Michigan and within the University was conducive to accepting major changes. The decision was made to initiate a gradual institutional shrinkage process. "Smaller and Better" became the motto, reflecting the intent to reduce the scope of the University's activities, staff, and budget at the expense of weaker faculty and programs.

How does an institution decide how to become smaller and better? In other words, which of the aforementioned budgetary and curricular reduction options should be selected? Faculty and administrators felt that it is necessary to first establish reduction guidelines and goals. The following parameters for the shrinkage process evolved:

1) the internal redistribution of cuts or "shared poverty" was not considered to be a viable option;

2) the continued delay of acquiring new equipment and renovating existing facilities was not considered healthy as it may lead to the "save now -- pay later" syndrome;

3) the categorical reduction of top salaries was not supported on grounds that the institution may lose its bargaining power with peer institutions;

4) the issue of tenure as a general principle was not to be questioned at this time;

5) any personnel shrinkage was not to be achieved at the disproportionate expense of junior faculty or affirmative action;

6) enrollment was to be assumed to remain constant (at least initially);

7) the process of reducing the size of the University was to be carried out with the active participation of the faculty.

The main goals for the institution were, first, to cope with the immediate impact of the recent reduction in state appropriations; second, to rebuild some of the teaching and research strengths lost during previous years due to lack of funds to maintain an exit-new hires staff equilibrium; third, to regain the flexibility the University had lost due to accumulative impact of successive annual shortfalls and inflation. This flexibility, it was argued, is necessary for the institution to be able to respond to new challenges, develop new programs, hire top faculty, pursue vital research, and acquire new equipment.

With parameters and general goals in place, the decision was made to pursue the following multi-level activities:

Strategies for Short-range Reductions	Strategies for Medium and Long-range Reductions
I. Across-the-board Reductions level: all	III. Long-range Faculty Reduction Planning level: college, department, program
II. Differential Reduction in non-academic units level: central, college	IV. Department / Program } - Discontinuance level: college, department, program

I. ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTIONS

During the summer of 1980 it became increasingly clear that state appropriations would fall considerably short of previous years. By fall the state was operating under an Executive order and indications were that higher education in Michigan would have to operate with an actual decline in state appropriations. Central administration was enforcing contingency planning throughout the University. Schools and colleges were asked to submit plans of how they

would intend to cope with General Fund reductions at percentage levels of 1 to 6. Clearly, in a highly labor intensive economy such budget reductions can only occur in the few remaining flexible dollar categories such as the pools of money set aside for new hires, equipment, and miscellaneous, including travel funds, TA positions, summer course monies, funds that already had been raided for some time. Contingency planning revealed that across-the-board cuts, particularly if continued into the near future, would gradually erode the strength and vitality of the University. These predictions convinced Executive officers that in addition to reallocations, expenditure reductions, and base budget reductions, other ways must be found to enable the University to cope with the economic predictions for the next several years. Varying in severity and lead-time, the following three strategies were intended to address the longer-range impacts of the economic situation.

II. REDUCTION OF NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The second aspect of the plan was one of selectively reducing non-academic units that are under the direct control of central administration. Academic Affairs staff reviewed the units and proposed to the Vice-President and the Committee for Budget Administration (CBA) the amounts to be cut. Need, cost, and centrality to the University were important criteria. Four units were identified by the CBA for immediate review while several others were earmarked for later evaluations. It is of interest to note that the subsequently appointed review committees were not charged to review these units, rather their mandate was to evaluate the impact of the suggested cutbacks. In two cases, the reviews concurred with the originally proposed degrees of reduction. Recommendation for the third unit was well below the initial proposal, while in the fourth case the conclusion was one of totally eliminating the unit rather than retaining a fraction as suggested. In addition, various alternatives were suggested of how

to supplement the units' budgets by charging fees and increasing user charges. Despite the fact that ample press coverage occurred and that the final recommendations will directly or indirectly affect most units and people on campus, relatively little occurred in terms of protest. Several reasons come to mind. First, the multiplicity of reviews may have prevented people from rallying to a particular focal point. Second, these units are neither tenure-housing nor do they have organizational mechanisms through which systematic coalition could be formed. Thus constituencies called upon for defense may have been less powerful. At this time indications are that these reductions will be implemented shortly, resulting in personnel reorganization, some lay-offs, and an overall saving of several million dollars.

III. LONG-RANGE FACULTY REDUCTION PROCEDURES

Although drastic reductions and potential discontinuance tend to generate tremendous interest in the press, a systematic plan to induce faculty shrinkage is potentially much more dramatic and certainly will generate intense discussions and unleash dynamics on the departmental and program level. Clearly, the overall goal for this plan is to put curricular goals into sharper focus, eliminate weak or unessential fields and staff and thus enhance the quality of the University.

The purpose of a long-range faculty reduction plan is that, in spite of General Fund shortfalls, some aspects of the academic curriculum receive new or additional attention. "Smaller" may involve fewer students in some units, fewer faculty, staff and administrators, fewer courses, a restructured curriculum, or a streamlined administrative apparatus. It is hoped that a reordering of priorities has the effect of affording better General Fund support for the remaining programs (Presidential speech).

The details of how to implement an overall shrinkage plan were left up to

the individual colleges to be worked out. Procedures depend upon such parameters as the internal organizational structure, established patterns of faculty participation in the decision-making process, as well as specific dynamics of the situation. Perhaps the most systematic and publicized process commenced in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts where departments have been asked to submit plans outlining how they propose to shrink over the next three to five years. Several of the general directives provided by the administration are worth noting.

1) The primary intent of this plan is to induce constructive curricular planning: to weigh curricular core needs against more esoteric addenda, determine cost/benefit factors regarding programs and subfields, and to evaluate the future of these specific components in light of current staffing realities.

2) Shrinkage is to be conceived of and measured in terms of faculty FTE rather than dollars. Two reasons were central to this decision. First, budgets are subject to various kinds of changes that would make long-range planning difficult, such as inflation, faculty leaves and sabbaticals, research grant support, and joint appointment shifts. The second reason was even more important: to reduce the temptation and possibilities of implementing cuts via budgetary measures such as reducing travel accounts, support staff, or equipment funds. In terms of faculty FTE, the goal is to shrink by up to 10% over the next three to five years.

3) Untenured faculty are not to be considered the primary prey in the shrinkage process. Also, recent affirmative action gains and future goals are supposed to be upheld. Regarding new positions, departments were asked to scrutinize and evaluate their faculty position needs within the context of longer-range departmental plans rather than to approach the request from the standpoint of replacing a particular person.

From the very beginning it was clear that such a comprehensive plan could only succeed if buttressed by an effective incentive structure. The following incentives are being considered and/or are already in use:

a. Departmental planners are encouraged to assume that reducing faculty does not necessarily mean that the budget lines are lost to the unit; some may in fact be traded to fill areas of growing demand.
b. Retirement incentives are being developed which would allow a person to retire before the age of 70 without the loss of either their regular salary or full TIAA/CREF benefits.
c. Chairpersons are urged to look upon the annual salary program as a meritorious reward system and stretch the "institutional average" from zero to whatever seems appropriate or possible at the other end of the scale.
d. A research incentive program was developed to supplement prestigious fellowship stipends with additional funds. Typically below regular salary levels, faculty have sometimes declined the acceptance of such awards. The supplement is designed to enhance their attractiveness, increase research possibilities, and contribute to raising faculty morale.
e. The mortgaging of future retirements is of course a very realistic and widely encouraged method. However, chairpersons are being discouraged from using it too extensively and thereby eliminating future possibilities for change.

At this point it is far too early to speculate about the potential impact and success of this shrinkage approach. So far, departmental plans have been submitted and it is conceivable that the projected faculty flow be simulated and analyzed in light of potential policy changes regarding hiring and promoting patterns. It may be quite difficult, if not impossible, to identify specific annual reduction goals, dollars and numbers which in turn would interface with the annual budget cycle and position request process. Other problems may arise in time, such as developing memoranda of understanding that are binding beyond the specific actors involved at this juncture. Finally, the unresolved and untested nature of tenure and what it means in a declining market will be an ever present concern.

IV. DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

None of the aforementioned strategies aimed at the more crucial issue of taking a serious look at the overall curriculum and the priorities and values it reflects in light of the fiscal predictions for the state and academic needs in general. To become smaller and better may require that curricular offerings and staff needs be evaluated with the goal to identify and possibly discontinue weak, less essential, or less cost-effective academic departments and/or programs.

Several years ago the University intended to eliminate two programs, a process which resulted in the dispersal of one unit and the degradation from department to program status for the other. While the final chapter on the effectiveness of these measures still needs to be written, the efforts did lead to the development of a set of guidelines to be applied to future termination cases. In October, 1979, the Regents approved Discontinuance Guidelines for Academic Programs that outline the kind of process to be followed, describe the role of the faculty, and mention the criteria to be taken into account, namely: a) centrality of the unit to the curriculum; b) quality of faculty; c) student demand and state needs; d) cost benefit factors; and e) faculty deployment possibilities. It is important to note that the definition of what constitutes a program is left to the discretion of the individual deans.

In the Fall of 1980, various deans and Executive Committees announced that several academic departments will be reviewed for potential discontinuance. Except for the final decision-making stages, the locus of review activities was to rest with respective College administrations.

Based on both the guidelines and previous program evaluations, the potential discontinuance process is one of the College making the initial selections, followed by thorough peer and external reviews, and, then, forwarding the

recommendation to the Vice President and the Board of Regents. Although there is no room here to discuss the procedures in detail, it seems worthwhile to share some of the main problems and dilemmas encountered. The following comments are based on the attempt to close the Department of Geography:

1) Participation of the University Faculty

Literature in organizational theory has suggested that the implementation of retrenchment contributes to centralization and more authoritative methods of governance (Riley & Baldridge, 1977; Cohen and March, 1974 etc.). Experiences here have shown that faculty (and students), although steeped in the collegial mode of governance, found it difficult to generate objections on substantive grounds, in part due to lack of overall information. Discussions inevitably seemed to focus on procedural matters such as the legitimacy of a particular criterion or specific data rather than the economic, curricular, and qualitative issues at hand. Realistic counter-proposals were rarely voiced, a situation which may lead to the impression that, ultimately, "tough" decisions cannot be made through democratic processes including the total faculty and consequently must be handled through representation.

These questions remain: When is early consultation supposed to take place? And how can it take place in a both constructive and realistic manner?

2) Consultation with the Department

The program discontinuance guidelines mandate that a department be consulted before the comprehensive review and decision-making process begins. It was found that this requirement cannot be fulfilled to everybody's satisfaction. It seems reasonable to assume that no unit would be able to assist constructively and objectively in a process that may lead to its demise. Particularly difficult is the requirement to allow for early consultation. On the one hand, once a target has been identified, the point of early consultation has passed. On the other hand,

fairly complete data need to be assembled before an initial decision "to open proceedings" can be made and be announced.

3) The Dilemma of Decentralization

Throughout the termination process the argument was made that the specific department is not the weakest and that, university-wide, many less qualified units enjoy peaceful existence. Clearly, in a highly decentralized system there are no mechanisms to conduct supra-collegiate comparisons regarding raison d'être and quality of units. Autonomy, in this case, shows its less desirable attributes.

4) Legitimacy of Review Team and Data

It was found that the good intentions prescribed in the guidelines for conducting peer reviews were difficult if not impossible to realize. Willingness to serve on a particular review committee automatically put these members in an adversarial position vis à vis the faculty under review as well as those who rally to the support of their beleaguered colleagues. It seems as though even the most thorough and objective members of a review team find themselves labeled adversaries if not henchmen. The same can be said about the data used. Comments of certain issues being unfair, irrelevant, incorrect, biased, seem to be part of the process.

5) The Department on Hand and the Discipline it Represents

Experiences nation-wide have indicated that the formation of anti-termination forces can assume powerful dimensions. While this can happen in terms of outright verbal protests or marches, a more subtle version is just as difficult to deal with. The reference here is to people outside the University inferring that a particular discontinuance will mean nothing short of passing judgment on the legitimacy of the discipline per se. Obviously, the extent to which such a spill-over effect

can occur is directly related to the national standing and prestige of an institution, an influence a university "normally" would not want to deny.

6) Making a Case for Discontinuance

Yet another problem encountered is the issue of confidentially and sensitivity of personnel information. Once again, those involved are caught in a dilemma. On the one hand, fellow faculty, students, and the community-at-large need to be convinced that measurable deficiencies exist, yet this has to be accomplished without "washing the laundry" of the affected faculty in public. The result is that public reports will be less convincing in their rationale for drastic action.

7) Criteria for Discontinuance

Recent experiences once again pointed out that the rationale for or against discontinuing a program or department is a rather unsettled issue.

The main cause of disagreement seems to be over the relative importance of quality vis à vis centrality of the discipline. The chart below illustrates how the interplay between these two criteria can cloud the decision-making process:

Quality	Centrality	Decision
high	high	Continuation
high	low	?
low	high	?
low	low	Discontinuation

If one is to attach primum causum status to quality one could argue that superior quality may result in more centrality; low quality, even in a typically central discipline, may cause a move away from centrality. Conversely, if centrality is one's main concern, low quality should be dealt with by assisting the unit

in attaining that status by weeding out weak faculty and/or by invigorating the unit with new blood and resources. The financial side of this argument becomes secondary in that centrality in the intellectual market place would seem to imply a certain justification for securing enough resources. Thus a problem may arise if evaluators are not in harmony on the priority of their criteria.

8) Equity in the Discontinuance Process

Termination cases over the past decade have indicated that the larger the unit is, the more difficult and the more national resistance the discipline can generate. The sheer force of disciplines such as Nursing, English, or History seems to protect weak subfields within it. Conversely, this would indicate that small departments and weaker disciplines are more vulnerable to be considered for closure. Evaluating the options, solutions need to be sought that allow for equity and efficiency. In the Geography case, the review team tried to accommodate this problem by differentiating between departmental and program (within the department) discontinuance. While at first glance the former seems to be the more dramatic of the two, the latter, in fact, is potentially much more radical in that it allows for the elimination of weak fields in otherwise strong and central departments, as well as for the retention of strong parts in otherwise weak departments. One of its major handicaps is that unless it is initiated by the departments themselves, it may be viewed as a witch hunt aimed at selected individuals. Due to this and other potentials for misuse, partial discontinuance remained an untested recommendation. The final recommendation for Geography was departmental discontinuance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The foregoing was a description of how one university decided to choose from the range of budgetary and programmatic options mentioned earlier. Deliberations

had led to the decision that further belt-tightening and deferring tactics were neither enough nor healthy. Thus more radical changes were initiated. Pursuing such degrees of change causes stress, critique, and anxiety on all levels of the institution. On the other hand, it should be noted that, nonetheless, it was an orderly process that allowed for voicing discontent and discussing alternatives. Adopting Balderston's terminology, the process is not one of managing survival, but rather one of seeking new stability while maintaining, if not improving, excellence.

While it is still too early to evaluate the short-range outcomes of these attempts in terms of dollars and positions saved, much less the long-range outcomes in terms of maintaining quality and developing flexibility, it may not be too early at this juncture to share a few suggestions with the higher education community:

The first recommendation is not to overestimate the utility of any guidelines. The newly developed Regental Program Discontinuance Guidelines played a useful role in serving as a point of reference at times as well as a scapegoat at other times. It must be noted, however, that one of the goals of these guidelines was to have been to guarantee an orderly method to facilitate faculty and student input. Experience has shown that since any process operating under these guildelines will ultimately be resolved by the Regents, the place of decision-making is quite removed from the place of impact and thus may in fact work counter to faculty participation. Similarly, operating under these guidelines will inevitably mean performing in the public eye. There is less room for bargaining behind closed doors, making concessions, or planning for inconspicuous phase-outs -- strategies that certainly have merit in some instances.

The second recommendation is to face the fact that there are definite limits to faculty and student participation in an institutional process as comprehensive as

this one. Clearly, the pros and cons of discontinuing a department or the quality of individuals cannot be discussed, much less resolved, by the collective faculty. The same can be said about student participation. The size of the institution and the complexity of its various budgets and existing commitments limit insight and thus the utility of input. Another factor is the rapidity with which some of these decisions need to be made to respond to unexpected shortfalls. Although ample provisions for participation ought to be built into the process, it is necessary to draw lines between advisory capacities on the part of faculty and students and decision-making powers of their representatives.

The third recommendation is to evaluate the role of Institutional Research Offices in the curricular change process. Experience has shown that validity of the data gathered and compared is directly related to who provided it and whether that unit or person is seen as an adversary or protagonist, as "administration" or "faculty." In the future, rather than having the administration gathering initial information, the affected department gathering "counter" information, and the Review Committee collecting yet another bulk of data, one might consider delegating the entire function to the Institutional Research Office. This would require that a fairly good idea and consensus is on hand as to what criteria should be taken into account and how much comparative data are needed and useful. One may be able to avoid criticisms regarding the lack of objectivity of information by having the data collected by what may be called a neutral third party. This method would also allow for some consistency regarding the release of background material to the public.

The final recommendation is not to open too many "cans of worms" during the process. Experience has shown that one particular activity/intent, perhaps the least popular one, will cause many skeletons or unresolved issues to emerge. For example: the extent of student participation, the relative power of small versus large departments, the extent of faculty governance in times of retrenchment, the untested status of

tenure, or the lingering ambiguity regarding the make-up of the curriculum and the priorities and values of higher education in general. One is reminded of Cohen and March's garbage can process, a model that reflects the fact that organizational phenomenon normally regarded as isolated and pathological begin to emerge if preconditions for more normal and rational process models are no longer present (Cohen and March, 1974 p.91.) The difficulty is that one cannot, in most instances, follow their advice and wait until these issues have found a new nexus around which to evolve and then quietly move ahead and decide upon the actual issue at hand.

REFERENCES

Balderston, Frederick E. Managing Today's University. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Bardach, Eugene. "Policy Termination as a Political Process." Policy Sciences, 7 (1976): 123-131. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elesrviet Scientific Publishing Company.)

Behn, Robert D. "How to Terminate a Public Policy: A Dozen Hints for the Would-be Terminator." Policy Analysis 4 (1978).

Cameron, James J. "Idology and Policy Termination: Reconstructuring California's Mental Health System." The Policy Cycle in Politics and Public Policy. Edited by J. May and A. Wildavsky. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publishers, 1978.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: Carnegie Commission, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G. Leadership and Ambiguity. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1974.

Davis, Carolyne K. and Dougherty, Edward A. "Program Discontinuance: Its Role in Strategies of Resource Allocation and Planning for Colleges and Universities." An unpublished paper. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1978.

DeLeon, Peter. "A Theory of Policy Termination." The Policy Cycle in Politics and Public Policy. Edited by J. May and A. Wildavsky. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publishers, 1978.

Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Kaufman, Herbert. The Limits of Organizational Change. University, Ala.: The University of Alabama Press, 1971.

Melchiori, Gerlinda S. Patterns of Program Discontinuance: A Comparative Analysis of State Agency Procedures for Initiating and Implementing the Discontinuance of Academic Programs. Research Report, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1980a.

Melchiori, Gerlinda S. From Default to Design: Coping with Curricular Change in Academe, Paper presented at the 1980 AIR Forum in Atlanta, Georgia.

Peckham, Howard H. The Making of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1967.

Riley, Gary L. and Baldridge, Victor J. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1977.